# Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina Round 4 Part 11

## Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina

### Round IV

Back < > Next

| |
|---|
|**Quote:**|
|If we had a different version completely opposite to what we have, you would have a point. But what we have is all there is. There is no other version of the history of Islam and Muhammad.|

Do you really hear what you are saying? What about the Quran? The book that preceded the hadith books by centuries! The Quran refers to all major wars and conflicts and even generously quotes the allegations and accusations of opponents. But, you are addicted with the stinky smell of hadith narrations and you try hard to engage me in a wrestling match in that location. No, my dear friend. I had been there and I am grateful to God for saving me from that. You might, however, continue enjoying your mud-slings with Sunni and Shiite opponents there. If I have time, I will be watching you with a smile on my face.

The Quran is allegedly the message of God to Man. It is certainly not a book of the history of Islam. From the Quran alone you can't learn about Muhammad, his companions, his linage, his wives and family, his deeds, his wars, his rituals and many other stories that make Islam understandable. Quran makes some passing mentions of the wars but certainly it is not a book of history about Muhammad's prophetic career. I have no intention to "wrestle" with you using the hadith as the proof in order to defeat you, like it was suggested in that inane remark about the "straw man". I already said, I rejected Islam just by reading the Quran and before even having read the hadith. The point that I am trying to make is that without the hadith your Islam is self made. Can you explain sura 111, sura 9 and sura Sura 38:41-44, or for that mater any sura, without referring to the hadith? You have no way to do that. Then what you say about the claim of the clarity of the Quran? (5:15) Or when it says that it is "easy to understand" (44:58 , 54:22 , 54:32, 54:40), is "explained in detail" (6:114), is "conveyed clearly", (5:16, 10:15) and there is "no doubt in it"? (2:1).

If these verses are true, can you explain the above suras? Let me remind you once again. I am not trying to make you revert to a hadith-believing Muslim. You have done already half of the job by rejecting the garbage of hadith. Now is time that you reject also the garbage of the Quran. I want you to see that the Quran is linked to hadith. That both of them are garbage

and both of them must be thrown in the dustbin of history. But to prove the Quran is garbage, we do not need to rely on hadith.

Furthermore, how do you know that the Quran preceded the hadiths by centuries? All you have is an undated book. You do not know how and when that book was written, unless you rely on the very hadith that you disparage.

Can you tell me what century Muhammad was born? Without hadith and sira how can you tell? You may say that this data is available from the history written by Persians and Romans. Why would you take the Persians and Romans sources as more legitimate than the sources written by Muslims?

Without the haidth, Islam can easily be dismissed as a myth. If the "corrupt leaders" were capable to fabricate so many hadiths with so much detail about a man and his people, (a miracle in itself) why couldn't they fabricate the Quran?

| |
|---|
|**Quote:**|
|How do you know that the Quran has not been tampered, especially when the same Muslims who were so dishonest as to fabricate thousands of hadiths on Muhammad and were left unchecked were the very ones who transmitted the Quran? In fact, even your mentor Rashed Khalifa admitted that the Quran has been tampered. http://www.submission.org/tampering.html<br><br>If the Quran has been tampered it throws out the claim that God has promised to preserve it. 15:9 The myth of inviolability of the Quran has been shattered. What guarantees we have that it has not been tampered more than once?|

Finally, a good  I would like to reserve a separate discussion onJquestion, a fair criticism protection of the Quran via its numerical structure.

Look forward to that!

| |
|---|
|**Quote:**|
|Is the entire history of Islam a fabrication? In that case what proof we have that Muhammad himself was not a fabrication? If the entire history of Islam is false, then what makes you believe that Muhammad ever existed? The whole thing could have been made up. Your first duty is to prove the very existence of Muhammad|

Again, you are confusing me with your Sunni friends! If I were in an island and found the Quran there among other books, and if I were able to understand its message and blessed to witness its scientific accuracy, prophecies and mathematical structure, I would not need anything else to believe in its accuracy. Do you hear me? Do you understand me? Besides, I am not a Muhammadan. Islam, as the system of peace and submission to God alone, existed long before Muhammad and will continue exists as a path for the truth-seekers long after him.

We will get to the “scientific accuracy", "prophecies" and "mathematical structure” of the Quran shortly. I think we should end your agony and get to it now. But it was important that our readers, see where you are standing and how “solid” is your position. I believe that is already established. So let us move on to the next topic. Let us talk about the Quran. Please answer the question I asked in the previous round page 6 of this debate.

| |
|---|
|**Quote:**|
|It is good that you see these contradictions. However these stories originate from the Quran. The claim that Muhammad was illiterate is in the Quran and the claim that he split the moon asunder is also in the Quran.|

The Quran does not claim that Muhammad was illiterate, but only illiterates of the Quran claim such. Quran claims that Muhammad was not reading any scripture, in other words, he was a gentile. Muhammad was a literate gentile, like many of his contemporary prominent Meccanians.

Let us say your interpretation of *illiterate* is the correct one and all the other Muslims are mistaken. Can you please tell me why so many Muslims misunderstand a book that is supposed to be so clear and easy to understand? Isn’t it fair to believe that those claims of the clarity of the Quran are exaggerations?

The Quran does not claim that Muhammad split the Moon, but only the splitters of holy lies claim such. The Quran refers to the end of the world and gives the splitting of the Moon as a sign for its coming close. I understand it as reference to the splitting the Moon surface by Apollo astronauts in 1969 when they took rocks from the Moon. I have a detailed argument on this in my Turkish books and inshallah you will find it in my upcoming Reformist Translation of the Quran.

Let us see what the Quran says and let us use your own mentor Rashad Khalafa's translation

The Hour has come closer, and the moon has split.
Then they saw a miracle; but they turned away and said, "Old magic."
They disbelieved, followed their opinions, and adhered to their old traditions.(54:1-3)

Muhsin Khan translates this verse thus:

**1.** The Hour has drawn near, and the moon has been cleft asunder (the people of Makkah requested Prophet Muhammad SAW to show them a miracle, so he showed them the splitting of the moon).

The commentator of the Quran Maududi writes:
"The amazing and wonderful phenomenon of the splitting of the Moon was a manifest sign of the truth that the Resurrection, of which the Holy Prophet was giving them the news, could take place and that it had approached near at hand. The great sphere of the Moon had split into two distinct parts in front of their very eyes. The two parts had separated and receded so much apart from each other that to the on-lookers one part had appeared on one side of the mountain and the other on the other side of it. Then, in an instant the two had rejoined.

Obviously you will dismiss Maududi's comments and will say he was mistaken. The problem is that he was not the only one:

Bukhari 6.60.387 says
"During the lifetime of Allah's Apostle the moon was split into two parts; one part remained over the mountain, and the other part went beyond the mountain. On that, Allah's Apostle said, "Witness this miracle."

The same theme is repeated in other hadiths: Bukhari 6.60.388, 6.60. 389 and 6.60.391

How can you explain that a book that is supposed to be clear and easy to understand with no doubt in it could mislead so many great scholars including Rashad Khalifa and every other translator of the Quran? Today all the Muslims believe that splitting the moon did really happen. Isn't it fair to say that the Quran is not as clear as it claims?

You say this splitting the Moon actually is a prophecy to the splitting of the moon surface by Apollo. You seem to be willing to accept anything just to convince yourself that the Quran

contains miracles. But the event in the Quran is described in the past tense which was given to people as a miracle and they still turned away and said "old majic". Also the word used is *Shaqqa* شَق which means split and not landing, or anything else.

Why would Muhammad claim such an absurdity? Obviously to pretend having fulfilled a biblical prophecy stated in Isaiah 24:23!

"*Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the LORD of hosts shall reign in mount Zion ."*

| |
|---|
|**Quote:**|
|That won't be a bad idea. I don't know whether we can prosecute a dead man. But this surely would make a sensational trial. If it can be done and if a lawyer is willing to joins me, it would be a great idea to take Muhammad to court. Or at least try to ban Islam under the anti hate law.|

Only an Inquisition or Taliban court would accept your evidence as credible. But, in case you find such a court in Texas or Saudi Arabia , please let the judge appoint me as Muhammad's attorney! I would be glad to represent him against Bukhari, Tirmizi, Ibni Majeh, Ibni Hanbal, Taberi, Waqidi and Ali Sina, combined.

Well you are acting as Muhammad' attorney here in this court of the public opinion. So let us see how you fair.

| |
|---|
|**Quote:**|
|Don't be impatient my friend. One thing at a time! First I'll pull the stool from beneath your feet. Once that is done I will move to discredit the Quran and use nothing but the Quran. In fact I left Islam only after reading the Quran. I only became familiar with the hadith afterwards.|

Now this is really funny. I never stood on that stool or wanted in the first place. You are the one trying to push it under my feet and each time I kick it you have being trying harder. Now, you are taking credit for your failure to insert that stinky stool under my feet? What logic are you using? In my first letter to you I invited you to discuss the Quran and you managed to extend the introduction with silly arguments from silly books.

The stool I am talking about is the claim that the Quran is self sufficient. That is a fallacy as it has been demonstrated.

I know you do not base your faith on hadith. The point is that with hadith you believe in fallacies and without hadith you believe in fallacies. Just because you rejected the hadith you are not out of the woods. You have jumped from the frying pan into the fire. Your total freedom will come when you leave Islam.

> So, it should be the last round that we discuss hadith. We should now move to the real argument. Are you ready for that, or you want to dwell more on hadith? You will not receive any response from me if you continue your bizarre insistence to force me to accept hadith. Then, you may claim your victory and continue your debates based on hearsay and ignorance.
>
> I hope you will kick that stinky stool under your feet. Hope Jthat it is not the only stool keeping you standing

We are already talking about the Quran. I think I have made my point clear that those who believe in the Quran only have no leg to stand on. This is to show that even if the Quran were a true book of God, the position of the Quran only crowd is fallacious. That is established already. By this exercise I do not want to make you believe in false hadiths. I want you to be honest.

Let me put your mind at ease. I make a solemn pledge that I will not use any hadith to prove Islam is false. I have not done it with you and will not do it. That would be foolish. It is like holding a gun to the head of your enemy and threaten to shoot if you do not surrender. Please give me a little more credit. If I use the hadith it would be in conjunction with a verse of the Quran and to explain the context of that verse. You are not required to accept that context/tafseer. You would be required to give your own interpretation of that verse without using the hadith. Then we leave it to the public to decide which interpretation is more plausible. All I am trying to do is to discredit your position and demonstrate that the Quran without hadith is incomprehensible. Obviously that individual who criticized me of using the straw man did not understand the difference. I do not know whether you understand or not. But there is a huge difference.

Nonetheless, the fallacy of the Quran will be demonstrated by the contradictions within the Quran and by the use of logic. No hadith will ever be used to as the authority to disprove the Quran. I will use the hadith for clarification, just as I did with the word ummi. You are entitled to reject that and present your own version. I hope now you can breath easier.